Dyon and magnetic monopole in Yang–Mills theory derived through the complementary gauge-scalar model

Shogo Nishino,[1,*] Ryutaro Matsudo,[2,†] Matthias Warschinke,[1,‡] and Kei-Ichi Kondo[1,2,§]

[1]*Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan*
[2]*Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science and Engineering, Chiba University, Chiba 263-8522, Japan*

We show that dyon and magnetic monopole can be constructed in the gauge-independent way for the $SU(2)$ Yang–Mills theory even in the absence of the scalar field. This result is derived from the recent proposal for obtaining non-trivial topological configurations responsible for quark confinement in the Yang-Mills theory based on the Confinement-Higgs complementary relationship between the pure Yang-Mills theory and the gauge-scalar model with an adjoint scalar field of the fixed length. We discuss how such configurations have the implications for quark confinement.

arXiv:1704.01276v1 [hep-th] 5 Apr 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Quark confinement is a longstanding unsolved problem in quantum chromodynamics (QCD). A promising scenario for quark confinement is the dual superconductor hypothesis [1] for the QCD vacuum. For this mechanism to work, magnetic objects to be condensed are indispensable ingredients. In the very beginning, therefore, one must show the existence of magnetic monopoles in the Yang-Mills theory even in the absence of the scalar field.

Recently, remarkable progress toward this direction has been made as to how to construct gauge-invariant magnetic monopoles in the pure Yang-Mills theory. It has been shown that magnetic monopoles can be defined in a gauge-invariant way by introducing a Lie-algebra valued field $\boldsymbol{n}(x) = n^A(x)T_A$ with a unit length $\boldsymbol{n}(x)\cdot\boldsymbol{n}(x) = n^A(x)n^A(x) = 1$, which is called the *color (direction) field*. The key step in this construction is that the color field $\boldsymbol{n}(x)$ is related to the Yang-Mills gauge field $\mathscr{A}_\mu^A(x)$ ($\boldsymbol{n}(x) = \boldsymbol{n}[\mathscr{A}](x)$) by solving the equation for $\boldsymbol{n}(x)$:

$$\epsilon^{ABC} n^B \left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{n}\right)^C = 0, \tag{1}$$

once an $SU(2)$ gauge field $\mathscr{A}_\mu^A(x)$ is given. Then the color field is identified with a functional of the gauge field, $\boldsymbol{n}(x) = \boldsymbol{n}[\mathscr{A}](x)$. The equation (1) is called the *reduction condition*, which is obtained as the stationary condition of the following functional (called the reduction functional):

$$\int d^4x \ \left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{n}(x)\right)^2. \tag{2}$$

See e.g., [2] for a review and reference therein. Indeed, such color field $\boldsymbol{n}[\mathscr{A}]$ enables the Yang-Mills theory to have a non-trivial magnetic charge q_m defined by

$$q_m = -\oint_{S^2_{\text{phys}}} dS_{jk} \ g^{-1}\epsilon^{ABC} n^A \partial_j n^B \partial_k n^C, \quad n^A n^A = 1. \tag{3}$$

In this framework, the relevant configurations for the color field $\boldsymbol{n}[\mathscr{A}]$ have already been investigated for the specific types of the gauge field configurations such as instantons and merons [3] where the $SO(4)$ symmetric ansatz for the gauge field in the four-dimensional Euclidean space was used to represent such Euclidean configurations.

In this paper, we revisit the same problem based on the relationship between the pure Yang-Mills theory and the gauge-scalar model with an adjoint scalar field of the fixed length, which was regarded as the Confinement-Higgs complementarity in [4]. Here the color field is replaced by the normalized adjoint scalar field $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)$ due to the complementarity relationship. Instead of solving the reduction condition in the pure Yang-Mills theory, we solve the field equations for the complementary gauge-scalar model. To obtain the solution, we adopt the most general spherically symmetric ansatz due to Witten [5] for the gauge field and a simple ansatz for the scalar field in the four-dimensional Minkowski space-time. In this way, we find the dyon and magnetic monopole for the pure Yang-Mills theory even in the absence of a scalar field.

*Electronic address: shogo.nishino@chiba-u.jp
†Electronic address: afca3071@chiba-u.jp
‡Electronic address: m˙warschinke@chiba-u.jp
§Electronic address: kondok@faculty.chiba-u.jp

II. FROM THE GAUGE-SCALAR MODEL TO THE YANG–MILLS THEORY

We start from the $SU(2)$ gauge-scalar model with the Lagrangian density,

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm YMH} = -\frac{1}{4}\mathscr{F}^A_{\mu\nu}\mathscr{F}^{\mu\nu A} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A + \lambda\left(\phi^A\phi^A - v^2\right), \tag{4}$$

where we have defined the field strength $\mathscr{F}^A_{\mu\nu} := \partial_\mu\mathscr{A}^A_\nu - \partial_\nu\mathscr{A}^A_\mu + g\epsilon^{ABC}\mathscr{A}^B_\mu\mathscr{A}^C_\nu$ of the gauge field $\mathscr{A}^A_\mu$ and the covariant derivative $\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A := \partial_\mu\phi^A + g\epsilon^{ABC}\mathscr{A}^B_\mu\phi^C$ of the *adjoint* scalar field ϕ^A. By definition, the adjoint scalar field $\boldsymbol{\phi}(x) = \phi^A(x)T_A$ $(A = 1, 2, 3)$ with the generators T_A of the Lie algebra of a gauge group $SU(2)$ transforms under the gauge transformation as

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}(x) \to U(x)\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)U^{-1}(x) \quad (U(x) \in SU(2)). \tag{5}$$

Then the covariant derivative $\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)\right)$ of the adjoint scalar field $\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)$ transforms in the same way as the scalar field (5):

$$\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)\right) \to U(x)\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)\right)U^{-1}(x). \tag{6}$$

Moreover, $\lambda(x)$ is the Lagrange multiplier field to incorporate the constraint that the radial degree of freedom of the scalar field $\boldsymbol{\phi}(x)$ is fixed:

$$\phi^A(x)\phi^A(x) = v^2 \quad (v > 0), \tag{7}$$

where v is a positive constant. Notice that the constraint (7) is gauge invariant due to (5).

From the Lagrangian (4), the field equations are obtained as

$$\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{F}_{\mu\nu}\right)^A + g\epsilon^{ABC}\phi^B\left(\mathscr{D}_\nu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^C = 0, \tag{8}$$

$$\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A - 2\lambda\phi^A = 0. \tag{9}$$

To eliminate the Lagrange multiplier field λ we multiply (9) by ϕ^A, and use (7) to obtain

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2v^2}\phi^A\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A. \tag{10}$$

By substituting this result (10) into (9), we obtain the field equation of the scalar field without λ:

$$\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A - v^{-2}\left(\phi^B\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^B\right)\phi^A = 0, \tag{11}$$

which is equivalently rewritten by introducing the normalized scalar field defined by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x) := v^{-1}\boldsymbol{\phi}(x), \tag{12}$$

into

$$\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^A - \left(\hat{\phi}^B\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^B\right)\hat{\phi}^A = 0. \tag{13}$$

Notice that the unit scalar field $\hat{\phi}^A$ has two independent degrees of freedom under the constraint $\hat{\phi}^A(x)\hat{\phi}^A(x) = 1$ $(A = 1, 2, 3)$. They are extra degrees of freedom if we wish to obtain the (pure) Yang–Mills theory which is expected to be complementary to the gauge-scalar model (4). Therefore, we need two more conditions to eliminate the two extra degrees of freedom. For this purpose, we can adopt, e.g.,

$$\chi^A(x) := \epsilon^{ABC}\hat{\phi}^B(x)\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)\right)^C = 0. \tag{14}$$

Although $\chi^A = 0$ $(A = 1, 2, 3)$ apparently give three conditions, they give indeed two conditions, since $\boldsymbol{\chi}$ obeys

$$\chi^A(x)\hat{\phi}^A(x) = 0. \tag{15}$$



FIG. 1: The relationship between this paper (with the double-line arrow) and the preceding works (indicated in the dotted box) [2].

It was shown [4] that the simultaneous solutions of the coupled equations (8) and (11) automatically satisfy the condition (14). (But the converse is not true.) See Fig.1 for the relationship between this paper and the preceding works [2]. By solving the differential equation (14), we can in principle write $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)$ as a functional of the gauge field $\mathscr{A}_\mu^A(x)$, namely $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}[\mathscr{A}(x)]$, and we can thereby drop the extra degrees of freedom carried by the scalar field $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. In other words, the gauge-scalar model after imposing the constraint (7) carries the same degrees of freedom as the pure Yang–Mills theory (in the level of field equations). We shall call the condition (14) the *reduction condition* in this sense. See [2] for more details.

It should be noted that the kinetic term of the gauge-scalar model is identical to the mass term of the vector field $\mathscr{W}_\mu^A(x)$:

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A = \frac{1}{2}M_W^2\mathscr{W}_\mu^A\mathscr{W}^{\mu A}, \quad M_W := gv > 0, \tag{16}$$

where $\mathscr{W}_\mu^A(x)$ is defined by

$$\mathscr{W}_\mu^A(x) := g^{-1}\epsilon^{ABC}\hat{\phi}^B(x)\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)\right)^C. \tag{17}$$

This fact is shown by a straightforward calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A =& \frac{1}{2v^2}\left[\phi^A\phi^A\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^B\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^B - \phi^A\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A\phi^B\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^B\right] \\ =& \frac{1}{2v^2}\left(\epsilon^{ABC}\phi^B\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^C\right)\left(\epsilon^{ADE}\phi^D\left(\mathscr{D}^\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^E\right) = \frac{1}{2}g^2v^2\mathscr{W}_\mu^A\mathscr{W}^{\mu A},\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we have used the constraint (7) and $\phi^A\left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi}\right)^A = \phi^A\partial_\mu\phi^A + g\epsilon^{ABC}\phi^A\mathscr{A}_\mu^B\phi^C = 0$ which follows from differentiating the constraint (7). Consequently, the mass of the vector field $\mathscr{W}_\mu$ is given by $M_W = gv$.

Due to (5) and (6), the massive vector field $\mathscr{W}_\mu^A(x)$ transforms according to the adjoint representation, i.e., in the same way as (5):

$$\mathscr{W}_\mu(x) \to U(x)\mathscr{W}_\mu(x)U^{-1}(x). \tag{19}$$

Therefore, the mass term (16) is gauge invariant. Thus the gauge-scalar model (4) with the constraint (7) can be regarded as the massive Yang–Mills theory with a gauge-invariant mass term (16). See [4] for more details.

III. ANSATZ

Because of the constraint (7) the unit scalar field $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)$ takes the value in the target space of the two-dimensional sphere S^2. Then, we can regard $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}(x)$ as the map from the sphere S^2 in the three-dimensional space to the target space S^2. Therefore, there could exist the topological soliton solutions related to the nontrivial homotopy group $\pi_2(S^2) = \mathbb{Z}$.

For the $SU(2)$ gauge field $\mathscr{A}_\mu^A$, in this paper, we adopt the most general spherically symmetric ansatz for the three-dimensional space (leaving time dependence), called the *Witten ansatz* [5]: for time t and three dimensional



FIG. 2: The Witten ansatz which depends only on the time t and the three-dimensional radius r.

radial length $r = \sqrt{x_j x_j}$,

$$g\mathscr{A}_0^A(x) = \frac{x^A}{r}a_0(t,r), \quad g\mathscr{A}_j^A(x) = \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{r^2}[1+\varphi_2(t,r)] + \left(\frac{\delta_{Aj}}{r} - \frac{x_A x_j}{r^3}\right)\varphi_1(t,r) + \frac{x_A x_j}{r^2}a_1(t,r). \tag{20}$$

The four profile functions $a_0(t,r), a_1(t,r), \varphi_1(t,r)$ and $\varphi_2(t,r)$ in the Witten ansatz remarkably depend only on the time t and the three-dimensional radius r. In other words, the Witten ansatz has a cylindrical symmetry if viewed from the four-dimensional space-time. See Fig.2. Notice that the original Witten ansatz was given in the Euclidean space, since it was used to obtain the multi-instanton solution.

If we set $a_1 = 0$ and $\varphi_1 = 0$, and assume that $a_0(t,r)$ and $\varphi_2(t,r)$ have no t-dependence: $a_0(t,r) = a_0(r), \varphi_2(t,r) = \varphi_2(r)$, then the Witten ansatz reduces to the Julia–Zee ansatz [6]:

$$g\mathscr{A}_0^A(x) = \frac{x^A}{r}a_0(r), \quad g\mathscr{A}_j^A(x) = \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{r^2}\big[1+\varphi_2(r)\big]. \tag{21}$$

Furthermore, if we set $a_0(r) = 0$, then this becomes the 't Hooft–Polyakov ansatz [7]:

$$g\mathscr{A}_0^A(x) = 0, \quad g\mathscr{A}_j^A(x) = \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{r^2}\big[1+\varphi_2(r)\big]. \tag{22}$$

For the scalar field ϕ^A, we adopt the simplest spherically symmetric ansatz:

$$\phi^A(x) = v\frac{x^A}{r}h(t,r). \tag{23}$$

The Lagrangian density (4) can be rewritten in terms of the profile functions as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}_{\rm YMH} =& \frac{1}{g^2}\left[\frac{1}{2}[\partial_0 a_1 - \partial_1 a_0]^2 - \frac{1}{2r^4}[\varphi_1^2+\varphi_2^2-1]^2\right.\\ &+ \frac{1}{r^2}\left\{\left([\partial_0\varphi_1 + a_0\varphi_2]^2 - [\partial_1\varphi_1 + a_1\varphi_2]^2\right) + \left([\partial_0\varphi_2 - a_0\varphi_1]^2 - [\partial_1\varphi_2 - a_1\varphi_1]^2\right)\right\}\\ &\left.+ \frac{1}{2}g^2v^2\left\{(\partial_0 h)^2 - (\partial_1 h)^2\right\} - \frac{g^2v^2}{r^2}\left(\varphi_1^2+\varphi_2^2\right)h^2\right],\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where we have abbreviated $\partial_0 := \partial/\partial x^0 = \partial/\partial t$ and $\partial_1 := \partial/\partial x^1 = \partial/\partial r$. After integrating out the angle coordinates θ and φ, the action for the four-dimensional space-time reduces to the action for the two-dimensional space with the coordinates $x^{\underline{\mu}} = (t,r)$ and the metric $g_{\underline{\mu\nu}} = \mathrm{diag}(1,-1)$ $(\underline{\mu},\underline{\nu} = 0,1)$:

$$S_{\rm YMH} = \frac{4\pi}{g^2}\int dt \int dr\, \left[-\frac{1}{4}r^2 f_{\underline{\mu\nu}}f^{\underline{\mu\nu}} + \left(D_{\underline{\mu}}[a]\varphi_a\right)\left(D^{\underline{\mu}}[a]\varphi_a\right) - \frac{1}{2r^2}[\varphi_1^2+\varphi_2^2-1]^2 + \frac{1}{2}g^2v^2r^2\partial_{\underline{\mu}}h\partial^{\underline{\mu}}h - g^2v^2\varphi_a\varphi_a h^2\right], \tag{25}$$

where we have defined

$$f_{\underline{\mu\nu}} := \partial_{\underline{\mu}}a_{\underline{\nu}} - \partial_{\underline{\nu}}a_{\underline{\mu}}, \quad D_{\underline{\mu}}[a]\varphi_a := \partial_{\underline{\mu}}\varphi_a + \epsilon_{ab}a_{\underline{\mu}}\varphi_b. \quad (a,b=1,2) \tag{26}$$

By using this action, we obtain the field equations for $a_{\underline{\mu}}, \varphi_a$ and h:

$$\partial^{\underline{\mu}}\left(r^2 f_{\underline{\mu\nu}}\right) + 2\epsilon_{ab}\left(D_{\underline{\nu}}[a]\varphi_a\right)\varphi_b = 0, \tag{27}$$

$$r^2 D_{\underline{\mu}}[a]D^{\underline{\mu}}[a]\varphi_a + \left[\varphi_b\varphi_b - 1\right]\varphi_a + g^2 v^2 r^2 h^2 \varphi_a = 0, \tag{28}$$

$$\partial^{\underline{\mu}}\left(r^2 \partial_{\underline{\mu}} h\right) + 2\varphi_a\varphi_a h = 0. \tag{29}$$

Because of the radially fixing constraint (7), we immediately find that the profile function $h(t,r)$ is equal to one:

$$v^2 = \phi^A(x)\phi^A(x) = v^2 h^2(t,r) \quad \Rightarrow \quad h(t,r) = 1. \tag{30}$$

By substituting $h(t,r) = 1$ into (29), we find

$$\varphi_a\varphi_a = \varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 = 0, \tag{31}$$

which implies

$$\varphi_1(t,r) = \varphi_2(t,r) \equiv 0. \tag{32}$$

This solution is unique as far as $h(t,r) = 1$ is satisfied.

It is easy to check that this is indeed a solution of (28). In this situation (27) becomes

$$\partial^0\left(r^2 f_{01}\right) = 0, \quad \partial^1\left(r^2 f_{01}\right) = 0. \tag{33}$$

This is easily solved

$$f_{01}(t,r) = \frac{C}{r^2}, \tag{34}$$

where C is an arbitrary constant. Thus we obtain the solution a_0 and a_1 up to the gauge degree of freedom:

$$a_0(t,r) = \frac{C}{r}, \quad a_1(t,r) = 0. \tag{35}$$

It should be remarked that the time dependence of the profile functions has disappeared by this choice for $a_{\underline{\mu}}$. Notice that the solution $a_{\underline{\mu}}$ is not unique, since $a'_{\underline{\mu}} = a_{\underline{\mu}} + \partial_{\underline{\mu}}\Lambda$ ($\underline{\mu} = 0, 1$) with an arbitrary function $\Lambda = \Lambda(t,r)$ is also a solution for a given $f_{01} = \partial_0 a_1 - \partial_1 a_0 = Cr^{-2}$. For example, we can set $a'_0 = 0$ by choosing $\partial_0\Lambda = -Cr^{-1}$, i.e., $\Lambda = Ctr^{-1} + \text{const}$. Then a'_1 becomes t-dependent $a'_1 = a_1 + \partial_1\Lambda = Ctr^{-2}$. But this is a gauge artifact. In fact, the gauge-invariant physical quantities to be calculated in the next section are not affected by the other choices for $a_{\underline{\mu}}$. Thus we will use the specific form (35) in the following arguments.

IV. DYON AND MAGNETIC MONOPOLE SOLUTIONS

Under these profile functions, the gauge potential $\mathscr{A}_\mu^A$ reads

$$\mathscr{A}_0^A(x) = \frac{x^A}{gr^2}C, \quad \mathscr{A}_j^A(x) = \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{gr^2}. \tag{36}$$

The chromo-electric field $\mathscr{E}_j^A$ and the chromo-magnetic field $\mathscr{B}_j^A$ are calculated as

$$\mathscr{E}_j^A(x) := \mathscr{F}_{0j}^A(x) = \frac{x^A x^j}{gr^4}C, \quad \mathscr{B}_j^A(x) := \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{jkl}\mathscr{F}_{kl}^A(x) = \frac{x^A x^j}{gr^4}, \tag{37}$$

and hence the magnetic charge q_m and the electric charge q_e are obtained

$$q_m = \int d^3x\ \mathscr{B}_j^A\left(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^A = \int d^2S_j\ \mathscr{B}_j^A\hat{\phi}^A = \frac{4\pi}{g}, \tag{38}$$

$$q_e = \int d^3x\ \mathscr{E}_j^A\left(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^A = \int d^2S_j\ \mathscr{E}_j^A\hat{\phi}^A = \frac{4\pi}{g}C = q_m C. \tag{39}$$

Notice that these definitions for q_m and q_e are gauge invariant. Thus the solution (36) represents a dyon which has both the unit magnetic charge q_m obeying the Dirac quantization condition [8] and the electric one q_e proportional to q_m. If we set $C = 0$, this dyon reduces to the Wu–Yang magnetic monopole:

$$\mathscr{A}_0^A(x) = 0, \quad \mathscr{A}_j^A(x) = \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{gr^2} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathscr{E}_j^A(x) = 0, \quad \mathscr{B}_j^A(x) = \frac{x^A x^j}{gr^4} \quad \Rightarrow \quad q_e = 0, \quad q_m = \frac{4\pi}{g}. \tag{40}$$

We cannot determine the value of C classically, but C will be determined by quantizing the electric charge q_e.

In fact, the formula (3) for the magnetic charge gives the same value $q_m = \frac{4\pi}{g}$ as (38) , if the normalized scalar field (23) $\hat{\phi}^A(x) = \frac{x^A}{r}$ is identified with the color field $\boldsymbol{n}(x)$.

The static energy E or static mass M of this dyon is obtained from the integral:

$$E = \int d^3x \ \frac{1}{g^2}\left[\frac{1}{2}[\partial_0 a_1 - \partial_1 a_0]^2 + \frac{1}{2r^4}[\varphi_a\varphi_a - 1]^2 + \frac{1}{r^2}\left\{(D_0[a]\varphi_a)^2 + (D_1[a]\varphi_a)^2\right\}\right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{1}{2}g^2v^2\left[(\partial_0 h)^2 + (\partial_1 h)^2\right] + \frac{g^2v^2}{r^2}\varphi_a\varphi_a h^2\right]. \tag{41}$$

We find that E for the solution (32) and (35) diverges due to the contribution from the short distance $r \approx 0$. To avoid the short-distance or ultraviolet divergence we introduce the short distance cutoff r_0:

$$E = \frac{4\pi}{g^2}\int_{r_0}^{\infty} dr \ r^2\left[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 a_0)^2 + \frac{1}{2r^4}\right] = \frac{4\pi}{g^2}\int_{r_0}^{\infty} dr \ \frac{C^2+1}{2r^2} = \frac{2\pi}{g^2}\frac{C^2+1}{r_0}. \tag{42}$$

This divergence at the origin $r = 0$ can be understood as follows: The dyon has a mass $M = E$ and hence the high energy modes or the massive modes φ_1 and φ_2 decay in the region $r > \mathcal{O}(M^{-1}) \approx r_0$ by a factor e^{-Mr}. For the infinitely large mass M, this yields $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$. Indeed, the massive vector field $\mathscr{W}_\mu^A$ defined by (17) is written in terms of φ_1, φ_2 and h under the Witten ansatz (20) and the ansatz for the scalar field (23):

$$g\mathscr{W}_0^A(x) = 0, \quad g\mathscr{W}_j^A(x) = \left(\frac{\delta_{Aj}}{r} - \frac{x_A x_j}{r^3}\right)\varphi_1(t,r)h^2(t,r) + \frac{\epsilon_{Ajk}x_k}{r^2}\varphi_2(t,r)h^2(t,r), \tag{43}$$

and goes to zero when $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$. Therefore this solution is meaningful only in the region $r > r_0$. This divergence is nothing but the divergence due to the self-energy of a point particle in the classical level.

The solution obtained in the above does not satisfy the Bogomol'nyi–Prasad–Sommerfield (BPS) condition [9] which saturates the inequality for the (lower) bound on the energy E based on completing the square:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \int d^3x\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{E}_j^A\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{B}_j^A\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left((\mathscr{D}_0[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left((\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right)^2\right] \\ &= \int d^3x\left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{E}_j^A - \sin\alpha\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathscr{B}_j^A - \cos\alpha\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left((\mathscr{D}_0[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right)^2\right. \\ &\qquad \left. + \sin\alpha\mathscr{E}_j^A\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A + \cos\alpha\mathscr{B}_j^A\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A\right] \\ &\geq vq_e\sin\alpha + vq_m\cos\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where α is an arbitrary angle. The energy E has the lower bound with the electric charge q_e and the magnetic charge q_m:

$$E \geq v\sqrt{q_e^2 + q_m^2} = vq_m\sqrt{C^2+1}. \tag{45}$$

The equality holds if and only if the following equations are satisfied:

$$\mathscr{E}_j^A = \sin\alpha\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A, \quad \mathscr{B}_j^A = \cos\alpha\,(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A, \quad (\mathscr{D}_0[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A = 0. \tag{46}$$

These equations (46) are the BPS conditions for a dyon.

The third equation in (46) is satisfied by (30) $h = 1$. The first and the second equations, however, are not satisfied, since $(\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\boldsymbol{\phi})^A = 0$ under the solution (32) $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0$ and (30) $h = 1$ while $\mathscr{E}_j^A$ and $\mathscr{B}_j^A$ have non zero values (37). Therefore, this dyon solution does not satisfy the equality in (45). But from the inequality we find the upper bound of the short distance cutoff r_0:

$$r_0 < \frac{\sqrt{C^2+1}}{2gv}. \tag{47}$$

Finally, we examine the reduction condition. It turns out that these ansatzes indeed satisfy the reduction condition (14):

$$\begin{aligned}&\epsilon^{ABC}\hat{\phi}^B\left(\mathscr{D}_0[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}_0[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\phi}-\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\mathscr{D}_j[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\phi}\right)^C\\ =&\epsilon^{ABC}\frac{x^B}{r}h(t,r)\frac{x^C}{r}\left[\frac{\partial^2 h(t,r)}{\partial t^2}-\frac{\partial^2 h(t,r)}{\partial r^2}-2\left(\varphi_1^2(t,r)+\varphi_2^2(t,r)+\varphi_2(t,r)\right)h(t,r)\right]=0,\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

without specifying the form of the profile functions φ_1, φ_2 and h. In other words, the reduction condition is automatically satisfied due to tensor structures adopted in the ansatz especially (23).

The reduction condition (14) is derived from the requirement giving the stationary values of the reduction functional defined by

$$F:=\int d^4x\ \left(\mathscr{D}_\mu[\mathscr{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\right)^2=\int d^4x\ \left[\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial t}\right)^2-\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial r}\right)^2-2\left(\varphi_1^2+\varphi_2^2\right)h^2\right].\tag{49}$$

We find that F is equal to zero $F=0$ for these solutions: (30) $h(t,r)=1$ and (32) $\varphi_1(t,r)=\varphi_2(t,r)=0$. Therefore, our solution corresponds to the absolute minimum of the reduction functional F, when it is Wick rotated to the Euclidean space.

V. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we have solved a coupled field equations for the $SU(2)$ gauge-scalar model with an adjoint scalar field when the adjoint scalar field has the fixed radial length. We assumed the Witten ansatz for the gauge field with the most general spherical symmetry for the three-dimensional space and the simplest ansatz for the radially fixed scalar field with the spherical symmetry. The obtained solution is regarded as a dyon which has both a unit magnetic charge obeying the Dirac quantization condition and arbitrary electric charge proportional to the magnetic charge. The dyon reduces to the Wu-Yang magnetic monopole in the limit of vanishing electric charge. Only these solutions are allowed as far as we assume the above ansatz. According to the complementarity relationship, the dyon and the limiting magnetic monopole can be regarded as the configuration realized in the Yang-Mills theory formulated without the scalar field.

From the viewpoint of the dual superconductor picture for quark confinement, topological configurations such as dyon and magnetic monopole can be candidates of field configurations responsible for quark confinement. However, dyon and magnetic monopole obtained in this paper are singular in the sense that the energy or the mass of such configurations are divergent due to the short-distance or ultraviolet behavior reflecting the self-energy divergence. They must be regularized in the classical level and should be renormalized in the quantum level. To avoid this pathology from the beginning, we need to consider the ansatz different at least for the scalar field reflecting different symmetry, as suggested from the preceding works [3]. This is the problem to be tackled in a subsequent paper.

[1] Y. Nambu, Phys. Rev. D**10**, 4262 (1974).
G. 't Hooft, in: High Energy Physics, edited by A. Zichichi (Editorice Compositori, Bologna, 1975).
S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rep. **23**, 245 (1976).
[2] K.-I. Kondo, S. Kato, A. Shibata and T. Shinohara, Phys. Rept. **579**, 1 (2015). arXiv:1409.1599 [hep-th]
[3] K.-I. Kondo, N. Fukui, A. Shibata and T. Shinohara, Phys. Rev. D**78**, 065033 (2008). arXiv:0806.3913 [hep-th]
N. Fukui, K.-I. Kondo, A. Shibata and T. Shinohara, Phys. Rev. D**82**, 045015 (2010). arXiv:1005.3157 [hep-th]
N. Fukui, K.-I. Kondo, A. Shibata and T. Shinohara, Phys. Rev. D**86**, 065020 (2012). arXiv:1205.4972 [hep-th]
[4] K.-I. Kondo, Phys. Lett. B**762**, 219 (2016). arXiv:1606.06194 [hep-th]
[5] E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 121 (1977).
[6] B. Julia and A. Zee, Phys. D**11**, 2227 (1975).
[7] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phy. B**79**, 276 (1974).
A.M. Polyakov, Sov. Phys. - JETP**41**, 988 (1975), Phys. Lett. B**59**, 82 (1975), JETP Lett.**20**, 194 (1974).
[8] P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. Poy. Soc. (London) Ser. A**133**, 60 (1931).
[9] E.B. Bogomol'nyi, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **24**, 449 (1976).
M.K. Prasad and C.M. Sommerfield, Phys. Rev. Lett. **35**, 760 (1975).